

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER POR PATENTS PO Box (430 Alexandra, Virginia 22313-1450 www.opto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO.		
10/756,970	01/13/2004	Kevin T. Foley	MSDI-223/PC444.06	3770		
52196 MEDTRONIC	7590 03/24/200	9	EXAM	MINER		
Attn: Noreen Johnson - IP Legal Department 2600 Sofamor Danek Drive MEMPHIS, TN 38132			HOFFMAN	HOFFMAN, MARY C		
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
			3733			
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE		
			03/24/2009	PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

	Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/756,970		FOLEY ET AL.		
	Examiner	Art Unit		
	MARY HOFFMAN	3733		

	WALL HOLLING TO	0700		
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence add	ress	
THE REPLY FILED <u>24 February 2009</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.				
<ol> <li>Al The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one or the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:</li> </ol>	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance FR 1.114. The reply must be filed	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request	
The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing				
<ul> <li>The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la</li> </ul>	ter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	date of the final rejection	n.	
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or ( MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(i		FIRST REPLY WAS FI	LED WITHIN TWO	
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filled is the date for purposes of determining the period of ext under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patient term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL.	ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing date	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as	
The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp.	liance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be t	filed within two months	s of the date of	
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the		
AMENDMENTS				
The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be  (a) They raise new issues that would require further cor  (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below  (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better  (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better  (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better  (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better  (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better  (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better  (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better  (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better  (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better  (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better  (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better  (d) They are not deemed to place the application in better  (d) They are not deemed to place the application in better  (e) They are not deemed to place the application in better  (e) They are not deemed to place the application in better  (e) They are not deemed to place the application in better  (e) They are not deemed to place the application in better  (e) They are not deemed to place the application in better  (e) They are not deemed to place the application in better  (e) They are not deemed to place the application in better  (e) They are not deemed to place the application in better  (e) The not deemed to place the application in better  (e) The not deemed to place the application in better  (e) The not deemed to place the application in better  (e) The not deemed to place the application in better  (e) The not deemed to place the application in better  (e) The not deemed to place the application in better  (e) The not deemed to place the application in better  (e) The not deemed to place the application in better  (e) The not deemed to place the application in better  (e) The not deemed to place the application in better  (e) The not deemed to place the application in better  (e) T	nsideration and/or search (see NOT w);	E below);		
appeal; and/or				
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a c	corresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.		
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).				
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12		mpliant Amendment (I	PTOL-324).	
<ol> <li>Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):</li> </ol>				
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) 66-70 and 94-103 canceling the non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>				
7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		be entered and an e	xplanation of	
Claim(s) allowed: <u>66-70 and 94-103</u> .				
Claim(s) objected to:				
Claim(s) rejected: <u>55-63.65.68 and 74.</u> Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 71-73.				
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE				
The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).				
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary</li> </ol>	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appear and was not earlier presented. Se	and/or appellant fail ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1	s to provide a ).	
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER</li> </ol>	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.	
11. X The request for reconsideration has been considered but	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:	

See Continuation Sheet.

12. ☑ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s).

3. 🛚	Other:			

/Eduardo C. Robert/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3733

/Mary C. Hoffman/ Examiner, Art Unit 3733 Continuation of 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): Claims 66-67, 69 and 94-103 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.

Continuation of 11, does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

Regarding claim 59 and dependents thereof, Applicant argues that it would not be obvious to consten the device of Moll with only two projections, since a number of projections agreed that not we shown in the Figures of Moll (see e.g., FIG 10D and FIG. 12G). Moll states in col. 18, lines 61-end, and at the beginning of col. 19, that the "maintainer" comprises a plurality of strips, or can be made by making a number of longitudinal cuts aimost from end cho-end- of a tube of suitable material. The examiner mains that it would be obvious to construct the device of Moll with only two projection (and two corresponding sitis). It is noted that Moll does not require anywhere in the disclosure that a certain number of strip or sitis are needed for the device to be operable.

Regarding Applicant's other argument, that Moll does not disclose a device with "at least one of said longitudinally extending slots having a narrowed area and a widened area extending axially from said narrowed area, said widened area having a greater with relative to said narrowed area to provide said flexible strip of material with a narrowed width which defines a flexion point to control outward deformation of said flexible strip of material to said outwardly buckled configuration," this argument is persuasive and the rejections of claims 66-70 and 94-103 under Moll (U.S. Patent, 552.7y9) have been withdrawn.